

PROPOSED COUNCIL STUDY ISSUEFor Calendar Year: 2004Continuing ☐New ☐Previous Year (below line/defer) ☒**Issue:** Board on Accessibility for the Physically Challenged**Lead Department:** Community Development**General Plan Element or Sub-Element:** Socio-Economic Element**1. What are the key elements of the issue? What precipitated it?**

A citizen suggested that a board be created of physically challenged persons to advise the City on accessibility issues. The suggestion is to have the new board be proactive in reviewing, recommending, and hearing appeals about accessibility standards throughout the City for both public and private projects. Currently, the city enforces accessibility standards as mandated by the State of California for private property. Accessibility for public property is under order of the federal ADA standards. The current standards require that accessibility upgrades be made in existing buildings with each building permit issued and new construction must be fully accessible. For public property (including sidewalks) the City has an existing proactive program to retrofit existing facilities to comply with ADA standards.

The existing Board of Building Code Appeals currently would hear any appeal of accessibility requirements. The citizen suggestion would create a new board to handle only accessibility issues. This study would examine whether or not such Board should be created.

2. How does this relate to the General Plan or existing City Policy?**Socio-Economic Element**

Policy 5.1A.2 Strive to assure that all residents have equal access to City services.

Action Statement 5.1H.9a. Maintain an active City policy that assures that disabled individuals have access to City programs and services.

Action Statement 5.1H.9d. Encourage and support efforts to allow disabled individuals to live independently.

3. Origin of issue:**Councilmember:** Howe, Fowler, Miller, Vorreiter**General Plan:** _____**Staff:** _____

BOARD or COMMISSION

Arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	Library	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bldg. Code of Appeals	<input type="checkbox"/>	Parks & Rec.	<input type="checkbox"/>
CCAB	<input type="checkbox"/>	Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/>
Heritage & Preservation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>
Housing & Human Svcs	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Board / Commission Ranking/Comment:

_____ Board / Commission ranked _____ of _____

4. Due date for Continuing and Mandatory issues (if known): _____
5. Multiple Year Project? Yes ☐ No ☒ Expected Year of Completion _____
6. Estimated work hours for completion of the study issue.
- | | |
|--|------------|
| (a) Estimated work hours from the lead department | 120 |
| (b) Estimated work hours from consultant(s): | 0 |
| (c) Estimated work hours from the City Attorney's Office: | 40 |
| (d) List any other department(s) and number of work hours: | |
| Department(s): Public Works | 70 |
| Finance | 10 |
| Total Estimated Hours: | 240 |
7. Expected participation involved in the study issue process?
- (a) Does Council need to approve a work plan? Yes ☐ No ☒
- (b) Does this issue require review by a Board/Commission? Yes ☒ No ☐
- If so, which Board/Commission? _____ BBCA
- (c) Is a Council Study Session anticipated? Yes ☐ No ☒
- (d) What is the public participation process?

Consultation with individual physically challenged individuals, meeting with Board of Building Code Appeals.

8. Estimated Fiscal Impact:

Cost of Study	\$ _____
Capital Budget Costs	\$ _____
New Annual Operating Costs	\$ To be determined by the Study. _____
New Revenues or Savings	\$ _____
10 Year RAP Total	\$ _____

9. Staff Recommendation

- ☐ Recommended for Study
☐ Against Study
☒ No Recommendation

Explain below staff's recommendation if "for" or "against" study. Department director should also note the relative importance of this study to other major projects that the department is currently working on or that are soon to begin, and the impact on existing services/priorities.

reviewed by

Department Director

Date

approved by

City Manager

Date